



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

cepted an invitation to give a course of lectures at the Lowell Institute on English Poetry — a subject in which he was a master; but he was taken ill just as he was about to leave home, and the trip had to be given up. It was a bitter disappointment to him. "Why didn't they ask me ten years sooner?" he said. He was interested in America. In connection with this great war he held the opinion that "the industrial system would go to pieces under the shock of civil war, and he expected that the beginning would be in America" (II, 652) — a view held by many socialists.

There is much more that is worthy of notice in this *Life*. Brooke was a man of many parts. He made for himself a prominent place in literature, and he could have done the same in art, his biographer assures us. He loved art, and he surrounded himself with its works. Pictures and books were his idols. Dr. Jacks has shown us this and has shown us many other things. He has succeeded in giving us a living picture of a living man. Instead of being a disadvantage to have been "done by a relative," it is a decided gain; and we close the book feeling that it is written by an artist and by a lover too.

ALBERT LAZENBY.

CAMBRIDGE, MASS.

THE CAMBRIDGE HISTORY OF AMERICAN LITERATURE. Edited by WILLIAM PETERFIELD TRENT, M.A., LL.D., Professor of English in Columbia University; JOHN ERSKINE, Ph.D., Professor of English in Columbia University; STUART P. SHERMAN, Ph.D., Professor of English in the University of Illinois; CARL VAN DOREN, Ph.D., Headmaster of the Brearly School. In three volumes—Vol. I, Colonial and Revolutionary Literature; Early National Literature, Part I. G. P. Putnam's Sons. 1917. Pp. xx, 584. \$3.50.

Some one has said that any number of facts independently stated are little better than gossip, but that even two facts shown in their relations are history. Evidently the relations in which facts may stand to one another are many and various. Broadly speaking, when history is concerned with literature, they may be divided into two classes — relations, like those of chronology, which when once established are indisputable; and relations, like those of schools or of influences, which must always remain more or less matters of opinion. At first glance the plan of the history whose first volume is now before us would appear to be of the former character; for we are promised that the second volume will concern "Early National Literature, Part II," and the third, "Later National Literature, 1850–1900." One would suppose, accordingly, that Book I,

which deals with "Colonial and Revolutionary Literature," would chronologically begin with the earliest literature produced in America and end with the period of the Revolution — extending at furthest to the adoption of the Constitution in 1788; and that Book II, which deals with "Early National Literature, Part I," would begin at this point and end at some other, definitely fixed, before 1850. A glance at the Table of Contents will correct this impression. To take only Book I, the first chapter, entitled Travellers and Explorers, is stated to cover the dates 1583–1763; the second, concerning Historians, runs from 1607 to 1783; the third discusses Puritan Divines from 1620 to 1720; the fifth, Philosophers and Divines from 1720 to 1789; the seventh, Colonial Newspapers and Magazines from 1704 to 1775; the eighth, American Political Writing from 1760 to 1789; and the ninth, the Beginnings of Verse from 1610 to 1808 — incidentally touching on such obviously affiliated writers as Mrs. Bradstreet and Freneau. Evidently, the plan of this book is in no severe sense chronological; it is based rather on what the fashion of our time is apt to call by the name, unpronounceable in English, of *genres*.

Here we come to a difficulty. What belongs in any given *genre* is clearly a matter of opinion. To go no further, it is not any too easy to draw a sharp line between newspapers and magazines on the one hand and political writing on the other; and a glance at the titles of chapters seven and eight will show these matters chronologically to overlap in this case by fifteen fairly animated years. Nothing but a dominating and authoritative central mind could quite disentangle such snarls as might easily get knotted here. Of such authoritative control, the first volume of *The Cambridge History of American Literature* shows no sign. Nothing could be less Rabelaisian than this morally blameless work, but hardly anything since Tristram Shandy has more faithfully observed the Theleman precept, "*Fais ce que voudras*." Now when it comes to planning a history as a matter of opinion, a man of genius may sometimes be able to do so in accordance with this excellently democratic principle; but the task is probably beyond the power of any four collaborators who ever lived — for no two of the four, however lofty their gifts, would often wish to do the same thing. In that case, either somebody must do something against his will or everybody must do as he chooses. The latter alternative has apparently been preferred, with cordial kindness of feeling, by the four eminent American scholars who are jointly responsible for the work now before us.

For this they are nowise to blame. What they have courageously attempted is to direct the composition of a coöperative history, in which each chapter is independently written by a competent person with no detailed knowledge of what is to precede or to follow it in the printed volume. A number of such attempts have previously been made in English. To go no further, this was the effort of the late Mr. Justin Winsor in bringing to light the Memorial History of Boston, and the Narrative and Critical History of America. He was a man of dominant personality, and he chose good people to write his chapters; but no one has ever been heard to wax enthusiastic over the result of his labors. This was the effort, as well, of the late Lord Acton, when he planned *The Cambridge Modern History*. Lord Acton is said to have been the most thorough master of modern history in all Europe during his later years. He was by blood and by training almost equally English and German. He was at once a devout Roman Catholic and a conscientious Liberal. There was never more honest, more earnest, more energetic, or more accomplished and learned a man. Yet even the main plan of his volumes, which he never lived to see published, is often perplexing. The confusion which pervades their pages may perhaps be held due to his premature death. Competent as the committee was which took up his task, they could not but lack the dominant precision of his unique individuality. There is reason to think, however, that even if he had directed the work from beginning to end it could hardly have been much else than it is — a collection of monographs widely differing in merit and supplemented by variously complete and authoritative bibliographies. *The Cambridge History of English Literature*, which presently followed, under the supervision of a committee headed by the Master of Peterhouse, Sir Adolphus Ward, confirms the impression that where Winsor failed, and even Acton, no group of men can reasonably hope to succeed. Just imaginably, a coöperative history which should confine itself to incontestable relations of fact, such as chronology, might, if executed with German docility, be of value to others than its publishers. No coöperative history which strays into the regions of opinion can possibly result in anything but confusion worse confounded. One might as well try to square the circle.

Clearly, however, a succession of monographs, loosely related but supplemented by bibliographies, may have considerable merits or faults as a matter of detail. It may therefore be worth our while to examine the first Book, of which seven of the nine chapters have already been specified; if this justifies itself in detail, its inevitable

lack of unity and coherence may be forgiven. The first chapter, by Mr. Winship, devotes thirteen pages to a pleasantly cursory discussion of Travellers and Explorers from Sir Humphrey Gilbert to a Dr. Hamilton, who made a pleasure trip from Annapolis to Portsmouth in the year 1744. The seemingly careful bibliography covers fourteen pages. One lists twelve anonymous publications, said to be arranged chronologically from 1610 to 1741 — but a stray one of 1622 lags on at the end; the remaining thirteen are arranged “alphabetically by the author’s name.” On the whole, the text and the bibliography seem conceivably disproportionate, and neither has anything to do with literature proper. The second chapter devotes seventeen pages to Historians, from Captain John Smith, who has already been touched on in the previous chapter, to Thomas Hutchinson. The last page and three-quarters are devoted to Hutchinson; but until the closing eleven lines nothing definite is said about his *History*. Then comes (p. 30) this masterpiece of expository criticism: “He was bitterly denounced by Otis and Samuel Adams, and he did not show an ability to appreciate them. He left untouched some important phases of Massachusetts history, and was indifferent to social and industrial changes. In spite of these faults, for which excuses can be made, he was the best American historian of his time. He treated narrative history in a philosophical manner and with simple and natural sentences whose charm endures to this day.” Of the five-page bibliography appended to this chapter, a page and a half concern John Smith. Incidentally the incorrect account of Daniel Gookin on page 25 indicates that the admirable *Life of Gookin* by his descendant, Mr. Frederick Gookin — not mentioned in the bibliography — has escaped the notice of the diligent writer of the chapter. The third chapter, which is more solid, is an effort to summarize and interpret the Puritan Divines. It gives two of its twenty-six pages to Increase Mather, and one and a half to Cotton Mather, “whose passionately distorted career,” it says, “remains so incomprehensible to us.” There is no specific account of the *Magnalia* — which has been called “the prose epic of New England Puritanism.” In revenge, the bibliography of Cotton Mather, mostly condensed from Sibley, enumerates four hundred and seventy-four published works, and ten manuscripts, but overlooks the remarkable *Angel of Bethesda*, in the library of the American Antiquarian Society — a manuscript-treatise on medicine, which, among other things, indicates dim foresight of bacteriology. The bibliography of Increase Mather covers eight and three-quarters pages. In all, the bibliography of the twenty-six-page chapter

extends to forty-two. Again, there seems to be somewhere a peculiar sense of proportion.

The fourth chapter is refreshingly different. It is a pleasantly discursive and interpretative essay on Jonathan Edwards by Mr. Paul Elmer More, who is quite unable not to write well. The trouble is that while Mr. More is a commentator of the first merit, he is not disposed to confine himself to the humdrum limits of a rigid historian. A paragraph of fact would have given his fifteen-page chapter what it lacks — a firm basis. The twelve-page bibliography appended by Mr. John J. Coes looks systematic and exhaustive. Everybody will agree in hoping that it is so.

The character of the fifth chapter, which devotes eighteen pages to Philosophers and Divines, and four to their bibliography, may be inferred from the statement (p. 72) that an "attack was especially directed against the middle of the five points of Calvinism," and the fact that — so far as the index and diligent search can prove — there is nothing in the whole book to indicate what the five points of Calvinism are, let alone their order. The sixth chapter, Professor Stuart Sherman's twenty-one-page discussion of Franklin, supplemented by a nine-and-a-half-page bibliography, is the first which gives a clear and systematic account of its subject; for once, one is reminded that the human mind is still capable of purpose, order, and proportion. But the bibliography neglects to indicate the unusual merit of Mr. John Bigelow's three-volume edition of the Autobiography, supplemented by admirably selected extracts from the Correspondence. The seventh chapter devotes thirteen very cursory pages to Newspapers and Magazines, and the two-and-a-half-page bibliography looks perfunctory. This is not the case, however, with the bibliography of equal length which Professor William Macdonald has appended to his orderly but not always definite eighth chapter, on Political Writing. He has really digested and selected his list of authorities; but he has neglected to tell us such details as when the men he discusses were born or what were the general outlines of their careers. The ninth and last chapter, which concerns the Beginnings of Verse, covers twenty-three and a half cursory pages, and incidentally finds no room for Phillis Wheatley. She appears, to be sure, in the ten-and-a-half-page bibliography, but why her volumes of 1773 should be classed under the Beginnings of Nationalism, only the Maker of the maker of the list can certainly know. This bibliography, by the way, shows an earnest passion for such subdivisions as will generally put anything where you would not expect to find it.

We are forced to the regretful conclusion that whoever seeks information from the first book of *The Cambridge History of American Literature* will find little more satisfaction in its detail than in its general plan. To warrant this opinion we have been compelled to indicate at perhaps tedious length a few confirmatory facts; there are plenty more.

With the second Book included in this volume we can deal more summarily, for it presents no new features. There are nine chapters, covering one hundred and seventy-eight pages. One of these chapters devotes eighteen pages to the Early Drama, 1756-1860 — a dreary waste from which the sole lingering survival is the refrain:

“Home! Home! Sweet, sweet home!
Be it ever [*var.* never] so humble,
There’s no place like home.”

To sustain this chapter there is a highly classified bibliography of seventeen pages. As to the general sequence of the chapters, they are so arranged that Henry Theodore Tuckerman is discussed before Irving, Irving — properly enough for once — before Bryant, Bryant before Willis, Willis before Fitz-Greene Halleck, all these before Brockden Brown and Cooper, and Herman Melville before Channing and Emerson. Only two of the chapters contribute anything in particular to the subjects which they discuss. Major George Haven Putnam, who personally remembers Irving, writes of him sympathetically and systematically, but is of opinion that his *Washington* is “great” (p. 259). Mr. Paul Elmer More writes fourteen interesting pages about Emerson, and provides a sixteen-page bibliography. His manner of treating his subject may be inferred from the sequence of the running titles which occur on every other page: “Emerson’s Method,” “Emerson’s Later Life,” “Emerson’s Teachers,” “Emerson’s Spontaneity,” and “Emerson’s Dualism.” His last words are: “The world had never before seen anything quite of this kind, and may not see its like again.”

So far as the volume of which the text thus ends purports to be a history, that sentence might be held symbolically to summarize it. It closes with an eighteen-page index, confined to the names of individuals and to titles, the latter printed in italics. This index includes the name of Achilles, whose “sorrowful, chafed soul,” we are told on page 268, “walked apart by the shore of the many-sounding sea.” As topography, and so on, is beyond its scope, the index makes no reference for one thing to the colleges which were in many aspects the nurseries of literature in America from the beginning up

to the last quarter of the nineteenth century. One is irresistibly led to a suggestion. Any work dealing with literature may happily follow the old custom of placing a motto on its title-page. In case this plan should appeal to the editors of the coming volumes of *The Cambridge History of American Literature*, they may find words ready for their purpose in the second verse of the first chapter of the Book of Genesis:

“And the earth was without form, and void;
and darkness was upon the face of the deep.”

BARRETT WENDELL.

HARVARD UNIVERSITY.

ENCYCLOPÆDIA OF RELIGION AND ETHICS. VII. HYMNS — LIBERTY. 1915. Pp. 911. VIII. LIFE AND DEATH — MULLA. 1916. Pp. 910. IX. MUNDAS — PHRYGIANS. 1917. Pp. xx, 911. Charles Scribner's Sons.

Since our last notice in this *Review* (July, 1914), three additional volumes have appeared, carrying the work down to the word “Phrygians,” and bringing it within a measurable distance of completion. The peculiarities of the editorial plan and the general character of the articles have been sufficiently described in our earlier notices. It remains to say that, contrary to what might have been expected in a work of so eminently international a character, the war seems to have had very little effect upon it. The editor is to be congratulated upon having achieved what even in times of peace is not easy to accomplish — keeping his distinguished contributors on from volume to volume. It is sincerely to be hoped that nothing may interfere with the speedy consummation of the undertaking, which, vast as it appeared in the programme, appears almost incredible in the accomplishment.

As in the former volumes, there are in these a good many composite articles; for example, at the beginning of volume VII, one on “Hymns”; in volume VIII, “Magic,” “Marriage,” “Missions”; in volume IX, “Music,” “Names,” “Nature,” “Philosophy.” Notable single articles are: “Jainism,” by Hermann Jacobi, “Karaites,” by Samuel Poznanski, “Indonesians,” by Kruijt, and “Melanesians,” by Codrington, to name but a few of many. As in the earlier volumes, philosophical subjects are given large room, and are treated generally from a Scotch standpoint. The long article, “Jesus Christ,” by W. Douglas Mackenzie, includes the whole history of Christology, down to the “present situation,” and deals with the subject from the point of view of the systematic